

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, as amended herein. Claims 1-9 and 21-32 were pending in the application. In this amendment, Claims 3, 6, 7, 9, 21-28, 30 and 32 have been canceled; Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 29, and 31 have been amended; and Claims 33-37 have been added. Therefore, Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 29, 31, and 33-37 are pending in the application.

This is a second response after final rejection. The Examiner did not enter the previous changes to the specification and claims stating that they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search and are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal. In the previous response, Applicants attempted to re-write the claims to make them easier for the Examiner to follow, but incorrectly indicated that the amended claims consisted of a combination of Claims 1 and 11; however, Claim 11 had been previously canceled and did not reflect allowable subject matter. Furthermore, one of the limitations was inadvertently omitted.

In this response, Applicants have amended the claims in their original numbered order by adding the changes suggested by the Examiner. Amended Claim 1 and its dependent claims correspond to the features illustrated in Figure 2 with panel 4 being the first panel and panel 5 being the second panel. Amended Claim 31 and its dependent claims correspond to the features illustrated in Figure 3 with panel 4' being the first panel and panel 5' being the second panel.

**Claims**

In the final office action and Advisory action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 3, 8 and 31 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. The Examiner indicated that the limitations of Claim 3 point out a structural feature that distinguish the instant invention over the prior art. As suggested by the Examiner, Applicants have included all of the limitations of Claim 3 into independent Claim 1, being the base claim. Claim 3

has been canceled. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 4, 5, and 29 depend from Claim 1, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable as amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 2, 4, 5, and 29 are also allowable.

In the final office action and Advisory action, the Examiner indicated that Claim 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. The Examiner indicated that the Claim 8 would be allowable because it depended from Claim 3. While not re-written in independent form, Claim 8 has been amended to depend from amended Claim 1, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable as amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claim 8 is also allowable.

In the final office action and Advisory action, the Examiner indicated that Claim 31 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. The Examiner indicated that the limitations of Claim 31 point out a structural feature that distinguish the instant invention over the prior art. As suggested by the Examiner, Applicants have re-written Claim 31 as an independent claim and included all of the limitations of Claim 1, being the base claim. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 31 is now in condition for allowance.

New Claims 33-37 mirror the same limitations as Claims 2, 4, 5, 8, and 29 and depend from Claim 31, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable as amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 33-37 are also allowable.

The Examiner's assistance in accurately describing allowable subject matter is gratefully acknowledged.


**Specification**

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because characters C1-C19 appeared at the beginning of several paragraphs throughout the specification. A substitute specification that includes all the changes previously made in the application, as well as the corrections required by the Examiner, has been provided. Five new paragraphs have been added to page 11 to clarify the embodiments shown in Figures 2 and 3, as required by the Examiner. The last paragraph on page 18 has also been amended to clarify the description of Figure 13. No new matter has been entered.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made a diligent effort to address the objections and rejections identified by the Examiner and respectfully submit that the outstanding objections and rejections in the Final Office Action have been overcome. In view of the above amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be patentable, and thus, the case is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowability is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. In the event that there is any question concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,



Signature of Jeffrey C. Maynard

Date

5/25/05

Jeffrey C. Maynard  
Reg. No. 46,208  
Attorney for Applicants  
WHITEFORD, TAYLOR & PRESTON L.L.P.  
Seven Saint Paul Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202-1626  
Phone: 410-347-9496  
Fax: 410-347-9414